DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 661 SP 028 365

AUTHOR Saunders, Robert L.
TITLE Efforts to Reform the Education of Teachers: Implications for Colleges of Arts and Science and Colleges of Education.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Education; *Educational Trends; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *Liberal Arts; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Length; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Nation at Risk (A); Nation Prepared (A)

ABSTRACT

A brief analysis of the reform movement in teacher education is presented, focusing upon the reports of the Carnegie Forum and the Holmes Group. Comparisons are made between the recommendations of the two reports, and it is pointed out that they are similar in terms of goals and directions, differing more in form than substance. Specific recommendations made in the reports are cited, with particular reference to their implications for colleges of arts and sciences, and the proposed liaison between these colleges and schools of education. This cooperation is seen as essential in light of the fact that there is virtually no way that teacher education programs can produce competent teachers without strong contributions from the colleges and departments of arts and sciences. The role of the arts and science colleges in teacher education is discussed within the framework of four major components of teacher preparation: general education/liberal studies; undergirding disciplines/pre-professional studies; academic specialization(s); and professional studies. Suggestions are made on facilitating the cooperation of schools of education and colleges of arts and sciences in the preparation of teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277661

Efforts to Reform the Education of Teachers: Implications for Colleges of Arts and Science and Colleges of Education

Robert L. Saunders

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. L. Saunders

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP028 365

Efforts to Reform the Education of Teachers: Implications for Colleges of Arts and Science and Colleges of Education

Robert L. Saunders, Dean

Introduction

I never expected that my seemingly casual conversation with Jack Wakeley ten months ago would come to this. But I'm delighted that it did. Jack had told your president, Lois DeFleur, that I had some notions about how education deans and deans of arts and sciences could and should work together toward the common goal of good programs for the education of teachers. It was then and in subsequent correspondence with Dean DeFleur that I learned of your plans to develop a liaison. I'm delighted to be here and thankful for the opportunity to share some notions with you, to applaud your initiative toward the liaison, and to engage in some dialogue. A serendipity is the chance to renew acquaintances with several of you whom I have known and worked with through the years.

The Reform Movement: A Brief Analysis*

An obvious question about the reform movement is "how long will it last?" For more than three years education has been in the national spotlight. The attention it has received has stimulated many positive initiatives, with increased resources for education being among the most important. Among the most important of recent developments is the talk of "teacher empowerment", "teacher

** Much of the credit for this analysis belongs to David Imig, Executive Director, AACTE, in a Board Memorandum, April 5, 1986.

professionalism", and improved working conditions for teachers. The growing public recognition and acceptance of these concepts and their incorporation in the national debate about education is important.

In April 1983, A Nation At Risk was unveiled. It was a report written by a distinguished group of lay leaders and professional educators that emphasized efficiency, standards and the content of the secondary school curriculum. It pointed to a previous era in which standards were more demanding and test scores higher. The emphasis in that report, and many of the subsequent 250 local, state and national reports, was with means and not ends. The debate about why we should transform the schools and for what purpose was less intense and less visible. A Nation At Risk told us our teachers were mediocre and our textbooks inadequate. It recommended stronger leadership in our schools and a core curriculum for our students. It implied that too much time was spent on teacher education and offered the hope that more academic preparation for prospective teachers would produce a new generation of more effective teachers.

In the intervening three years debate about schools and teachers has been more intense. The outpouring of rhetoric by committees, commissions and study groups has been overwhelming. At the same time national leadership, in the form of the Federal Government, has all but disappeared. While Washington became the focal point for a different debate, one about cultural conservatism and traditional values, 50 different reform movements emerged and moved forward. For state leaders, particularly the governors in the Southeastern part of the country, public school reform became a popular political agenda. Through their leadership, some 700 new educational laws were enacted

and over $3.5 billion in new monies allocated to public schools.

While some questioned the long-term effect of these laws and others worried about finding ways to sustain the momentum of reform, teacher educators were caught in the midst of a public perception difficult to correct. Much of the reform agenda was driven by the perception that teachers in schools were inadequate and inadequately trained. Talk of massive teacher shortages fueled discussions of finding ways of attracting more and better candidates to teach and prompted calls for profound adjustments in teacher salary schedules and ways of staffing schools. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) responded to the reform movement by convening its own Commission on Excellence for Teacher Education which, subsequently, issued its own report. While this report, A Call for Change in Teacher Education, influenced many, it failed to ignite the type of response earlier reports had caused. Its sixteen recommendations offered a course of action for teacher education that was quickly deflected. The call for higher standards, more rigorous programs, greater attention to clinical experiences and more reliance upon "the knowledge base" of teaching and learning failed to excite widespread reform and did little to shake the popular perception of low quality and casual program requirements in teacher education.

With the report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy A Nation Prepared: Teachers of the 21st Century, the debate took a new form. Instead of condemning the existing system of schooling, this group of professionals and politicians determined that we need a new generation of young people who are smarter, more skilled and sophisticated and more competitive. The report calls for better prepared teachers and see more autonomous and responsible teachers as

essential to the transformation of schools and education. While Carnegie's appeal is for the future economic viability of American society, it builds a persuasive argument for providing an excellent education for everyone.

While the Carnegie Forum report differs little from the report of the Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers, in its description of an appropriate curriculum and structure for educating prospective teachers, it is the prominence of those associated with the Carnegie initiative and the commitments of governors, state legislators, state school commissioners and other decisionmakers to review the report during the summer of 1986 that makes it a serious part of the reform effort. During the summer we gained a better basis for projecting the report's impact on policy and decisionmakers. The issuance of Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, in August 1986 by the National Governor's Association, gave added impetus to the concepts and ideas inherent in the Carnegie report. Whether, in light of a stalled economy, the resources can be found to implement these recommendations remains to be seen.

Three further concerns which may influence the reform movement are (a) the growing attention "at-risk children", (b) the worrisome impact of low economic growth and worker productivity, and, (c) the troubling use of drugs by teenagers. Attention to these concerns may prompt a renewal of commitment to helping marginal students meet higher standards. Advocates for minority students as well as business leaders worried about the quality of the entry-level labor force are being heard in the Congress and at the state level. The burgeoning population of "at-risk children" is being recognized. The statistics are becoming commonplace; one out of four of the children in the

class of 2001 lives in poverty; 14 percent are children of teenage parents; 15 percent do not speak English; more than a third will see their parents divorce before they are 18; and, it is likely, 25 percent will drop out of school before graduation. Finding new ways to educate this population is of paramount importance. Articulating the responsibilities of teacher educators for the preparation of teachers capable of affecting these youth is our challenge. The other consideration grows out of the Carnegie Report. In the recognition that growth in worker productivity in this country lags behind that of Japan and other industrialized countries. The output per hour of labor in the United States has grown only 2.2 percent in the past decade, at a time when Japanese productivity has grown 5.6 percent. Since productivity determines the standard of living of a society and is an indicator of economic strength, increasing recognition of this "threat" could prompt renewed interest in schools as contributors to the future viability of the society.

Reform Initiatives and Teacher Education

I was asked not only to comment on the Carnegie Report, but to compare it with the Holmes Report, (which John Palmer was asked to summarize) and then to tease from both reports implications for you as deans of Arts and Sciences. An interesting challenge, to say the least.

The Carnegie Report is similar to the Holmes Report in terms of goals and directions, differing more in form than substance. For example, both reports call for sweeping change in the way teachers are prepared. Each calls for an Arts and Science undergraduate degree as

a pre-condition for admission to teacher education. Both envision a tiered staffing model, or a plan for staff differentiation. Whereas both reports make a case for veteran, exemplary teachers being identified, given appropriate classifications or titles, and being assigned significantly higher and more complex responsibilities, the Carnegie Report makes the case more strongly and with more captivating words and phrases, such as "lead teachers," "teacher empowerment," "professional autonomy," to mention only three. It is clear that whereas Holmes believes that the roles of upper level teachers cannot be maximized unless teachers are better trained, the Carnegie Report makes that linkage more clearly and forcefully.

Both Carnegie and Holmes see the need for teacher education programs to be changed significantly, so much as to perhaps be called revolutionary. Both believe that only substantive, powerful, and committed institutions should be allowed to operate preparation programs. Holmes hit this matter head on, clearly saying that only those institutions which have strong research and development missions, capabilities, and good track records should be allowed to prepare teachers. They put their money where their mouths were and restricted charter membership invitations accordingly - with a few notable exceptions, in both directions. Carnegie, on the other hand, finessed this controversial subject (properly in my view) by remaining silent on the matter of institutional capability. The serious reader has no trouble seeing, however, that Carnegie's view of teacher education means that only the strong and highly committed institutions will be able to operate the kind of program advocated in the report. Should the model advocated by Carnegie become the standard (as I hope will happen, and is to a considerable degree already in operation at

Memphis State) it will be better for incapable institutions to elect not to try than to be told up front that they aren't strong enough to even be given the chance.

Another way to compare the Holmes and Carnegie reports is in terms of focus, what they emphasize and apparently wants to accomplish. In this respect, the Carnegie report is considerably broader in scope, containing eight recommendations which range from making salary and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions to the creation of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Holmes, on the other hand, talks almost exclusively about teacher preparation and work conditions that will be necessary if the teachers prepared via the Holmes model are to function effectively. But, again, it is important to remember that both Holmes and Carnegie advocate a bachelors degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching. It is important to remember, also, that NCETE recommended essentially the same thing.

It is well known that the notion to abandon the baccalaureate in education, require the degree in arts and sciences, and have professional studies in education conducted at the masters level has not met with unanimous approval - within the profession and without. SREB, for example, recommends "a revitalized four-year program that truly represents college-level work and followed by [good] beginning teacher programs" before implementing five-year programs on a broad basis. SREB does agree, however, that five-year programs should be "tested and closely monitored and evaluated", otherwise, no one will know whether different ways of preparing teachers made a difference in student learning. There is less than unanimous agreement, I'm told,

in ACSESULGC (the land-grant, state university group), even though most of those institutions have been invited to join Holmes. Moreover, it is believed that some institutions which have joined are not committed to transform their programs from four to five years by 1990, a membership requirement, but rather have joined for other reasons and with the belief that in the final analysis it won't be necessary to have five-year programs.

The education deans in AASCU (state college) institutions and those in AILACTE (independent, liberal arts colleges) have issued position statements that are essentially opposed to the notion. But, as we all know, professional organizations rarely speak for all constituent institutions, and that is true in these cases. Several of the 8 or 10 institutions which already have five-year programs hold membership in AASCU and AILACTE. In the main, however, there is more support for five-year programs among the land-grant, state universities than in the small liberal arts colleges and in those which like my own evolved out of a normal school, teachers college model and for the most part belong to AASCU. In our case at Memphis State, we feel something like Nathan Hale must have felt. We have a program in operation that sounds very much like what both Holmes and Carnegie advocate, but we were not invited to join Holmes. The fact that most of my TECSCU (the education deans group of AASCU) fellow deans object to the five-year program, plus my natural proclivity toward paranoia prevents my feeling comfortably at home in TECSCU.

What does all this mean for colleges of arts and sciences and for the liaison you propose to build with education deans? A lot, as I'll try to point out in the remainder of this paper.

The liaison you propose is needed, whether or not teacher

education programs are extended. It is long overdue. It is unfortunate that no broad based, concerted effort has been made to establish one since the Bowling Green conference in the 1957. The absence of viable, good faith, working relationships between colleges of arts and sciences and education very likely has prevented teacher education from being as strong as could have been - and should be. Who knows, but had we been working together harmoniously and effectively through the years our programs might have been sufficiently good - and sufficiently credible - so as to have made the current reform move either unnecessary or of lesser intensity.

My forecast is that most of the nations 1300+ institutions will retain four-year programs for at least another decade. Restricted to this amount of life space, it will be terribly important for their students to receive the very best courses and the very best assistance you can offer. My fear is that, even so, four-year programs simply cannot produce the kind of teacher needed for tomorrow's schools - or today's for that matter.

It is also my forecast that during the next decade we will see a fairly large number of institutions develop and implement five-year programs - and a few six-year programs as well. These institutions, sometimes individually and sometimes in concert, will fashion the next generation of teacher education models. Once a critical mass of institutions has been reached, the movement will accelerate and become the standard. How long this transitional period will be is difficult to predict, but I should think it will be less than the 30-35 years it took normal schools to be replaced with four-year programs. In either case and in any event, the role of colleges of arts and sciences is a critical one; indeed, an essential one. There is <u>virtually no way</u>

that teacher education programs can produce competent teachers without strong and essential contributions from your colleges and departments. Stated below are the reasons I say this and some forms I hope your assistance will take.

The Arts & Science Role in the Education of Teachers

I will now be more specific in my comments about the role of Arts & Science Colleges in teacher education. I do this with the belief that your roles will not be functionally different as a result of the Holmes, Carnegie and NCETE reports, but the importance of your roles and how you play them will be different. But first, it might be helpful to give a brief overview of the make-up and taxonomy of teacher education.

In 1982 an AACTE Task Force produced a fine report on the profile of the beginning teacher (1982). The report identified four major components of teacher preparation, as follows:

A. General Education

B. Disciplines Undergirding Education (Pre-professional)

C. Academic Specializations(s)

D. Professional Studies

This report went on to "profile" the nature and type of studies subsumed under each of these headings. It is a fine report and I recommend it for your reading.

General Education/Liberal Studies

This is a very important area of study, one that has been treated rather satisfactorily in teacher education in regard to life-space

(hours) but in recent years has deteriorated in terms of course nature and purpose. General education has been victimized to some extent by turf fights, by the increasing trend toward vocationalization for all majors to be more career oriented, and by the use of courses as prerequisites for specialized study rather than for general, liberating purposes.

I agree with Boyer's (1981) statements about what general education should provide, namely, "knowledge that enables students to understand themselves, their society, and the world in which they live." Such studies, Boyer contends, "should serve as a tool throughout life to solve problems, to think critically, and to comprehend past, present, and future events." He identifies six fundamental, interrelated areas necessary to do this for students. These areas are: (1) communication, (2) understanding the important of groups and institutions, (3) understanding the relationship of society and work, (4) understanding the relationship of nature and universe, (5) understanding the relationship of time and civilization, and (6) understanding shared values and beliefs.

There is, I fear, a great difference in what we see posing as general education/liberal studies and the kind of curriculum Boyer proposes. Typically, this component consists of 45-60 semester hours of fragmented, largely unrelated, courses which add up to whatever the student is able to make of them. Not only are present courses disjointed and fragmented, too often they are confined to lower division, survey-type courses. As noted above, more often than not the courses are seen as prerequisites, leading to another course on a linear scale and on to a graduate major, which in turn leads to an advanced graduate major. Lee Shulman (1986) of Stanford puts it

bluntly, as follows: "The courses at best add up to an unappetizing "goulash", at worst to an inedible mess."

We in teacher education compound the problem by permitting sizable chunks of general education to be used as part of the teaching field(s) content - add a few more courses in social studies to the general education requirement and you have a teaching endorsement. This practice is abominable - on two counts - but it goes on in most states even today.

The need to improve our programs in general education is one of the major messages being given us by state boards of education and legislatures when they mandate standardized tests for both the admission into and graduation from teacher education programs. Both Carnegie and Holmes underscore the need for improvement. So does SREB (1985), citing this area as a need which must be met before we go on to longer (five-year) programs.

To summarize this section, I use a phrase from the 1985 NCETE report, entitled "A Call for Change in Teacher Education. The report stresses the importance of a "cohesive, planned program - not merely an accumulation of courses scattered across a large number of departments."

Undergirding Disciplines/Pre-professional Studies

This component has just recently surfaced as a visible part of teacher education. Formerly it was subsumed under general education in some institutions and in others treated as professional studies (Foundations of education professors like to say that they must spend half of their time teaching students the undergirding disciplines (psychology, philosophy, sociology, etc.) before they can teach

pedagogical applications and implications.)

In any event, too little as been done with this component. Not unlike medical practice, pedagogy is largely an applied science - and sometimes an art. It has predicates and underpinnings upon which its theories and formulations are based. It is not good enough to place this subject matter under the rubric of general education and trust that it will be done well. Nor is there enough time and space to attend to this component within the professional studies area.

AACTE's Profile of the Beginning Teacher specifies the nature and purpose of the undergirding disciplines. Recommended are studies in anthropology, philosophy, psychology, and sociology, among others, because they offer contextual knowledge that undergirds professional practice in teaching as well as in other social professions. As a result of these studies, the report contends, teacher candidates should:

1. understand the principles and modes of inquiry that illuminate human behavior, cultural influences, social institutions, and significant political, economic, and philosophical systems;
2. understand the major human and technological factors that foster and inhibit effective communication among individuals and social groups;
3. gain a sense of the disciplinary roots of professional practice shared by teachers and other human service professionals.

In other words, just as engineering depends upon preprofessional studies in physics, chemistry and mathematics; and medicine upon chemistry, biology, and physiology, so are studies in pedagogy

dependent upon prior learnings in the social and behavioral sciences, particularly the disciplines of psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science and economics. Without these studies, the professional component of the teacher's preparation is built upon a weak foundation.

Academic Specialization(s) - Teaching Fields

Absolutely essential in the preparation of both elementary and secondary school teaching is the in-depth study of an academic discipline(s), those subject areas included in the school curriculum for which a teacher will have instructional responsibility. The "either-or view" debate about content or method in the preparation of teachers is false, dangerous and passe'. Effective teachers possess knowledge of the subject matter as well as pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Teachers especially need (and get all too infrequently) knowledge about their teaching field subject matter--the elements of the subject matter, its logical structure, its uses, its modes of inquiry, and ways in which information s manipulated and dependability determined. Denemark and Nutter, (1980), made this important point six years ago, and others, notably B. O. Smith (1983) and more recently Lee Shulman (1985) make it even more emphatically. I am talking here about more than a mastery of the facts of subject matter. I contend that only if the teacher understands the knowledge field can she teach that field.

This assumes, of course, that teaching is more than imparting facts and information. To make this point even clearer, I use a phrase from my colleague Frank Murray (University of Delaware) in his recent article in Change Magazine (1986): "The traditional major

often does not confer a level of understanding that empowers the teacher (or even the typical college graduate) to understand, for example, why magnetic force is not a good analogy for gravitational force, why some light objects sink while some very heavy ones float, why Fifth Amendment protections are vital, why the invention of the number zero was critical, why scientific laws are not ever proved but only disproved, how the sun "burns" in an outer space vacuum of no oxygen, why non-representational art is still art, and so on. Few college graduates, in fact, can give a coherent response to the inevitable child's question of why people in the southern hemisphere do not fall off the earth.

[The essence of reform] is that all teachers, at secondary and elementary levels alike, shall understand the subject matter they teach in depth, with those understandings based both on the integrity of disciplinary knowledge and the needs of classroom professionals to prompt pupil learning. This ever-so-necessary reform cannot go forward without the full commitment of all university departments whose majors go on to teach."

Although academic majors are almost always recommended for secondary teacher preparation, such in-depth study could be of great value to elementary teachers--if the attainment of a major is not at the expense of the broad-range of other subject fields included in the teacher's assignment, and if the staffing pattern of employing school systems takes into account the need for balance among the specialty areas of the teachers recruited. In fact, the NCETE report, "A Call for Change in Teacher Education," advocates an academic major even for elementary school teachers.

We are exploring this possibility at Memphis State for elementary education students. Shortly we will propose to Jack Wakeley and his college two alternatives for students completing undergraduate programs in preparation for the fifth year MAT program:

(a) a major in liberal studies which in effect would be a series of minors, one in each of the four main areas included in the elementary curriculum: science, math, languages, and social science.

(b) a language/communication major built along the lines of Ernest Boyer's contention about the centrality of language (not just English, and certainly not a major that depends primarily on literature). Boyer's notion is that the essence of teaching is language-communication, and that subject achievement and other learner outcomes are entirely dependent upon that process.

There is another problem in the specialization component, one that causes teacher educators find themselves in an "Catch 22" situation. Many of us would gladly restrict students to a single teaching field in order for them to obtain an academic major of the depth and nature referred to above. This makes good sense. But it is extremely difficult to do this in the face of demands from employing school administrators who often prefer versatile teachers, persons who can teach in at least two fields, not infrequently a third, and occasionally a fourth field. There is simply no way to do this within a four-year curriculum, or even in a five-year curriculum for that matter. It should come as no surprise that virtually every state certification program permits subject certification with rather low requirements - often little more than the courses taken to meet degree

requirements in general education. Our critics should keep this in mind when they assert that teachers don't know their subject matter. Indeed, some do not - for the reason just mentioned.

The Professional Studies Component

My assignment and the time allocated preclude any substantive comments about this component of the preparation program, but I can't resist making two observations that are pertinent to our discussion. The first is that some research is underway at Stanford (Lee Shulman and others - 1985) which suggest that each subject or discipline has its own pedagogy. Shulman contends that one cannot understand a subject field without simultaneously knowing how the field is mastered. I don't understand this concept fully (nor do the researchers, for that matter) but lots of our folks are getting excited about it and believe that when fully explicated it will call for some rather creative ways for arts and science faculty and education faculty to work cooperatively in the preparation of teachers.

The second observation is that as preparation programs move to post-baccalaureate status and employ more clinical and internship experiences (emphasized in Holmes, Carnegie and NCETE), the need for subject field mentors becomes increasingly important. At Memphis State we have developed trifold mentoring teams consisting of clinical teachers, pedagogical specialists from the College of Education, and a cadre of subject area specialists from Arts and Sciences. These teams are working together harmoniously. Our students are simply delighted and seem to feel that their preparation is greatly enhanced by this kind of arrangement.

To summarize this section, I have described the anatomy of a teacher's pre-service preparation and the role of Arts and Science in such programs. I have noted that should teacher preparation become increasingly more like what the Holmes, Carnegie and NCETE reports recommend, the importance of your roles increases tremendously. I hinted that your work will be more difficult. Let me add, in conclusion, that in the programs of tomorrow you will share more in the accountability for the way teachers are prepared. By and large you have been spared this dubious honor, but in five-year or in fifth-year programs wherein Arts and Science degrees and subject major are required as a pre-condition for admission to professional programs, you will be given credit for the good ones and blamed for the ones with weak academic credentials. Welcome to the accountibility swamp! We've been in it since 1978!

Beyond the Commission Reports: Some Common Sense Ways of Working Together Toward a Common Goal

My final comments are based on some commonsensical contributions you can and should make to the education of teachers. These are based not so much on the recent commission reports as they are on the already - known and persisting needs of teachers, including both those preparing for careers and those already on the job, and the myriad of problems schools are grappling with as they respond to escalating expectations and as they function within incredibly complex socio-economic - and political environment.

Some of these comments were made in my correspondence to Dean Despondence to Dean DeFluer back last March.

1. Recognize that for Arts and Science colleges, as for Education colleges, there is almost a "siamese twin" kind of relationship between public schools and colleges and universities. On the one hand, colleges and universities are dependent upon schools for both the number and quality of students received and educated. Our work in higher education is affected, positively or negatively, by the nature and quality of instruction students receive before they get to us. On the other hand, we are obligated (particularly in the multipurpose universities which have the tripartite roles of instruction, service and research) to regard K-12 schools as a completely legitimate and highly important public. Most often the service we render is credit instruction to school people, determined largely by us according to our perceptions of their needs and how we think those needs can best be served. Too frequently these perceptions are unrealistic and based on limited knowledge.

2. Develop programs (credit and non-credit courses and other services) school personnel need to enable teachers already on the job to improve their teaching field content by updating and extending their knowledge-base. This need has become a national issue and a serious problem. To put it bluntly, many teachers completed preparation programs that are 20 years old. Many of those programs were inadequate even at the time. By this I mean that many elementary teachers, middle school teachers and even some high school teachers simply did not complete academic preparation programs that were very extensive. Here we are two decades later with a great emphasis on academic quality in the schools but with teachers inadequately prepared in the academic field.

This problem is exacerbated by the fact that many of these

teachers neither need nor could qualify for "graduate level academic courses" typically offered in Arts and Science departments, especially in those universities where masters-level courses and programs are designed primarily as preludes to doctoral programs. Neither party is served well when teachers are given that single option to upgrade their academic, teaching field capability. What is needed, instead, are courses designed primarily for teachers, courses that address their academic needs and shortcomings and which were designed for that purpose! A few institutions are beginning to do this (the most notable one that I am aware of being the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill).

As implied above, this problem is receiving national attention. The Southern Regional Education Board recently held a conference addressing this matter. The proceedings of that conference have been published and can be obtained by writing Dr. Eva Galambos, Research Associate, Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta.

3. The delivery system for courses arts and science colleges offer for teachers need to be changed. Most of the formal courses that teachers are able to take understandably come in late afternoons, evenings, Saturdays, and during summer sessions. There is a widespread perception that arts and science colleges are insensitive to this fact and are reluctant to offer graduate level courses during these periods is one. Some education schools have filled that void by offering subject-oriented courses with education prefixes. This is not a defensible substitution, but an understandable one. Much could be gained from our exploring ways that this void could be filled, recognizing the limitations inherent in the university calendar and ways faculty appointments are made, that is, nine-month contracts with

summer teaching being optional.

4. Deans of education and deans of arts and science colleges should spend more time getting better acquainted, trying to understand each other's roles and responsibilities more fully and to destroy some of the myths that surround our two groups of university faculty. I am referring here to the stereotypes frequently reported, such as that arts and science faculty hold education faculty and education students in low regard, insult teacher education students enrolled in their courses and admonish bright students for having elected teacher education as a major. Education faculty are not applauded for their service work with schools. Dr. Harry Judge (University of Oxford, England) put it forthrightly: "working with persons held in low esteem are similarly accorded low esteem by their university colleagues."

Conversely, education faculty and administrators stereotype arts and science faculty and as being snobbish, reluctant to help students apply subject matter to their chosen professions, and place publications at such a high priority that both instruction and service frequently suffer. These uncomplimentary perceptions get in our way a lot and prevent our working together as profitable as would be desirable. We can't build mutual respect by attacking each other.